

It is well-established that a motion for reconsideration is an extraordinary remedy that should be granted “very sparingly.” *Fellenz v. Lombard Inv. Corp.*, 400 F. Supp. 2d 681, 683

(D.N.J. 2005) (quoting *Maldonado v. Lucca*, 636 F. Supp. 621, 630 (D.N.J. 1986)). Davidson has not met this high standard, nor does he explain how he satisfies any of the necessary requirements for granting a motion for reconsideration, namely, (1) an intervening change in the law, (2) the availability of new evidence, or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice. See *North River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995). Therefore, Davidson's request must be denied.

Furthermore, and contrary to Davidson's assertion that the Court simply "entered a stipulation" regarding the appointment of counsel, the Court has already analyzed all the relevant factors for the appointment of counsel, and found Zwerling Schacter and Szaferman Lakin to be appropriate and adequate counsel in this matter. There is no reason to overturn or otherwise modify this determination.

THEREFORE, IT IS, on this 22nd day of May 2013,

ORDERED that Davidson's Motion to Modify the Court's May 5, 2014 Order Designating Plaintiffs' Lead Counsel and Local Counsel is DENIED; and it is further

ORDERED that *Davidson v. BlackRock Advisors, et al.*, Civil Action No. 14-2863 shall be consolidated with *In re BlackRock Mutual Funds Advisory Fee Litig.*, Master File No. 14-1165, pursuant to the Court's Order of May 5, 2014.

/s/ Joel A. Pisano

Joel A. Pisano, U.S.D.J.